

## An Extract From *Fundamental Line and Question Of Unity*

### II. Partisan warfare as a form of partial struggle

We are surprised at the way in which a document is introduced into our discussions. C.P.Reddy group has included it in the list of the documents which are supposed to be meant for discussions. They are silent about everything that has to be said about it.

It is a fact that there is one such document. It is about 20 years old as its date-line suggests. It was known as *Kishan Document*. Though it represented the official tactical line of the party for some time, it was never implemented. It was never discussed even by the leading cadres. A major part of the leadership of the period also did not know that such a document existed.

As far as we are concerned, we reject the whole document because it is fundamentally opposed to the path of people's war. Hence we do not deem it necessary either to defend the document in toto or in parts. If we go into the document, the C.P. group's understanding of the partisan warfare does not even coincide with that of the document or the part they quote. It does not touch the fringe of that mass approach the quotation contains.

The document replies to the question when and how to begin partisan warfare in the following lines:-

*".....in a big and topographically suitable area, when the peasant movement has risen to the level of seizure of land, the question as to how to effect that seizure and how to defend the land so seized will become a burning, live question. The party is of the opinion that partisan warfare in such a situation, undertaken on the basis of genuine mass peasant movement, and the firm unity, under the leadership of the party, of the peasant masses, especially the most oppressed and exploited strata, combined with other forms of struggle such as social boycott of landlords, mass peasant struggle, agricultural workers strike, can, if correctly conducted and led, have*

C.P. group is trying to hide the neo-revisionist nature of the document by making use of Stalin's name. Mr.Sundaraiah has referred to Kishan document -- they call it as document of "*Tactical line*" -- in his book, *Heroic Telangana Revolutionary Struggle -- Its Lessons*, he has written like this:

*"Here one thing has to be said. Certain parts of the document were not included in the Policy Statement. The questions as well as answers given to them in connection with the discussions that took place between the delegation of our party and Central Commission of Soviet Party were also among those that were not included. In fact such omitted parts are not part and parcel of Policy Statement. They were meant only to explain certain theoretical issues and principles that formed basic theoretical basis of the Policy Statement. (Retranslated from Telugu version p.493).*

Thus neo-revisionists do not accept *Kishan Document* as it is. They are saying that "*It is meant only to explain certain theoretical issues and principles that formed basic theoretical parts of their Policy Statement (they have announced that it is their Tactical Line).*" Thus it is clear that this document is connected with neo-revisionist line. "*Kishan document*" is another name for the document, *Indian Situation in 1951*. (This is what Mr.Sundariah has referred to as *Tactical Document*).

Revisionists and neo-revisionists claim that writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin are the basis for their programme and tactics (Neo-revisionists cite Stalin's writings also). We do not accept their contention. We are fighting them by exposing the opportunism practised by them in the form of giving false interpretation to the writings of these great men and their application to Indian situation.

But this is not the nature of *Kishan document*. It says that Chinese path is not applicable to India and formulated that guerilla warfare which is one of the important experiences of Chinese revolution as "one powerful weapon in the arsenal of revolutionary movement" alone. Thus *Kishan document* has rejected the path of people's war by saying that it is not applicable to India. Whether this document has got Stalin's approval or not, or whether it is Stalin's document or not is, not a point for discussion here. The point is whether it accepts the path of people's war or not. When it does not contain a single point that accepts the path of people's war and rejects Chinese

path, is it not a travesty of truth to say that "it is clear from Kishan document that comrade Stalin has suggested mainly this path as the path of Indian revolution"? The leadership of this group is either not in a position to understand the path of people's war and "*Kishan document*", or is prepared to take up the path of neo-revisionism by hiding itself behind the claim that there is the path of people's war in the document, which in fact does not exist. We have explained in our document how the arguments of Somaiah are closer to the arguments of neo-revisionists. We have pointed out how C.P. Reddy group is accepting "*Kishan document*" as the basis of people's war path which is claimed by neo-revisionists as their "theoretical basis". It is obvious that except for revolutionary phrasology there is no difference in the programme and practice of "Marxists" and this group.

They themselves are sunk in the quagmire of neo-revisionism. To hide this, they are calling their opponents -- referring to us, without naming -- as brand new revisionists. This may serve their purpose of slandering us. But this word by itself cannot prove us as revisionists. On the other hand, this only exposes their hatred and enmity towards us and the defeat that they have met in the field of ideological struggle.

.....  
.....  
.....

(1971)